



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,756	09/12/2003	Shohei Yamada	468-39	5993
23117 7590 09/23/2008 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
EXAMINER				
DEAN, RAYMOND S				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2618				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/23/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/660,756

**Applicant(s)**

YAMADA ET AL.

**Examiner**

RAYMOND S. DEAN

**Art Unit**

2618

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 8-14, 18-23, 47, 57, 58 and 61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18-21 and 61 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 6, 8-13, 22, 23, 47, 57 and 58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Final Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/08
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments, see remarks filed June 17, 2008 with respect to Claims 5, 8, 11, 18, and 61 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of said claims has been withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

There had been a need in the art, at the time of the invention, to integrate recording broadcast features into a mobile phone or mobile terminal. Additionally, there also had been a need to record broadcasts when there is an incoming call to the mobile terminal or an outgoing call from said mobile terminal thus preventing a mobile user from losing desired broadcast content when interrupted by an incoming call. There are a finite number of predictable potential solutions to this above need: 1) automatic record of the broadcast when there is a call and 2) manual recording of the broadcast when there is a call. A person of ordinary skill in the art, upon reading the Engstrom reference, would have also recognized and have good reason to pursue the above know options of manual and automatic recording of the broadcast, which would lead to a reasonable expectation of success.

3. Applicant's arguments filed June 17, 2008 with respect to Claims 6, 12, 47 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Claim 6, Engstrom teaches a broadcast recording method utilizing a terminal device having a broadcast signal receiving function and a communication function (Figure 5, Cols. 8 lines 46 – 50, lines 51 – 55), comprising: detecting an incoming or outgoing call during receiving of a broadcast signal (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3).

Engstrom does not teach detecting a failure to receive the broadcast signal during the receiving of a broadcast and selectively recording the broadcast signal in the mobile terminal device or in a recording device installed in an external recording server when an incoming or outgoing call is detected or recording the broadcast signal in a recording device installed in an external recording server when a failure to receive the broadcast signal is detected

Cahill teaches detecting a failure to receive the broadcast signal during the receiving of a broadcast (Col. 7 lines 17 – 35, the loop will speed up during signal recovery, the signal will be recovered when there is exiting of a fade).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Engstrom with the failure detection method of Cahill for the purpose of providing optimal receiver performance during fading conditions as taught by Cahill.

Lee teaches recording the broadcast signal in a recording device installed in an external recording server when a failure to receive the broadcast signal is detected

(Sections 0035 lines 1 – 4, 0038, not connecting within a certain period of time prevents the broadcast signal from being received, which is a failure to receive the broadcast signal).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Engstrom in view of Cahill with the above capability of Lee for the purpose of providing backup storage for broadcast information when the mobile cannot record said information as taught by Lee.

Regarding Claim 12, Engstrom teaches a communication device comprising: a broadcast signal receiver for receiving the broadcast signal (Col. 8 lines 53 – 55); a receiving signal recorder for recording the broadcast information acquired from the received broadcast signal (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3), a call detector for detecting an incoming or outgoing call, or termination of an incoming or outgoing call (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3); and a recording-start/playback command information generating circuit for generating recording-start and playback-command information (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 36 – 39, lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3), notifying the receiving signal recording portion about the broadcast signal recording command information (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3, in order to start recording or start playback there will need to be a notification to start recording or playback).

Engstrom does not teach a receiving-status detector for detecting a status of the broadcast signal receiving.

Lee teaches a receiving-status detector for detecting a status of the broadcast signal receiving (Sections 0035 lines 1 – 4, 0038, not connecting within a certain period of time prevents the broadcast signal from being received).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Engstrom with the above capability of Lee for the purpose of providing backup storage for broadcast information when the mobile cannot record said information as taught by Lee.

Regarding Claim 47, Lee teaches a broadcast recording method utilizing a mobile terminal device having a broadcast receiving function and a mobile communication function comprising recording a broadcast signal in a recording device installed in an external recording server when it is impossible to record the broadcast signal in a recording device installed in the mobile terminal device (Sections 0035 lines 1 – 4, 0038, not connecting within a certain period of time makes it impossible to record the broadcast in the mobile device).

### ***Double Patenting***

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a

terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

5. Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11 - 13, 22 - 23 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 2 - 23 of copending Application No. 11/652472. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the features and concepts set forth in Claims 2 - 23 correspond to the features and concepts set forth in Claims 2 - 23 of Application 11/652472.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Note: The Applicants' claims are designated as ('756) and the reference claims are designated as ('472).

Claim 2 ('756) corresponds to Claim 2 ('472) except ('756) uses the following phrases: "the incoming or outgoing", "receiving of the", "the", and "when". ('756) has also deleted the following phrases: "a call termination detection step for", "a recovery detection step for", and "a recording stop step for", however, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the reference application ('472) is the same concept and

functions the same as application ('756) with the exception of the above phrases and deletions. The changes are only cosmetic. All claims that depend from Claim 2 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above.

Claim 4 ('756) correspond to Claim 4 ('472). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the reference application ('472) is the same concept and functions the same as application ('756). All claims that depend from Claim 4 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above

Claim 6 ('756) corresponds to the combination of Claims 6, 5, and 1 ('472) (Please Note: Claim 6 depends from Claim 5, which depends from Claim 1). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the reference application ('472) is the same concept and functions the same as application ('756). All claims that depend from Claim 6 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above

Claim 8 ('756) corresponds to Claim 8 ('472). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the reference application ('472) is the same concept and functions the same as application ('756). All claims that depend from Claim 8 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above

Claim 9 ('756) corresponds to Claim 9 ('472). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the reference application ('472) is the same concept and functions the same as application ('756). All claims that depend from Claim 9 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above

Claim 11 ('756) corresponds to Claim 11 ('472). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the reference application ('472) is the same concept and functions



the same as application ('756). All claims that depend from Claim 11 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above

Claims 12 – 13, 22 – 23 ('756) corresponds to Claims 12 – 13, 19 – 23 ('472). One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the reference application ('472) is the same concept and functions the same as application ('756) with the exception of the above changes. All claims that depend from Claims 12 – 13, 19 – 23 are rejected for the same reasons set forth above.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

7. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al.  
(US 2002/0013143)

Regarding Claim 47, Lee teaches a broadcast recording method utilizing a mobile terminal device having a broadcast receiving function and a mobile communication function comprising recording a broadcast signal in a recording device installed in an external recording server when it is impossible to record the broadcast signal in a recording device installed in the mobile terminal device (Sections 0035 lines

1 – 4, 0038, not connecting within a certain period of time makes it impossible to record the broadcast in the mobile device).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1 – 4, 10, 22 – 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engstrom (US 7,065,333)

Regarding Claim 1, Engstrom teaches a broadcast recording method utilizing a terminal device having broadcast signal receiving function and communication function (Figure 5, Cols. 8 lines 46 – 50, lines 51 – 55), comprising: detecting an incoming or outgoing call during receiving of a broadcast signal (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3).

Engstrom does not teach inquiring whether the broadcast signal should be recorded or not when an incoming or outgoing call is detected and starting recording the broadcast signal in response to an input that commands recording. However, there had been a need in the art, at the time of the invention, to integrate recording broadcast features into a mobile phone or mobile terminal. Additionally, there also had been a need to record broadcasts when there is an incoming call to the mobile terminal or an outgoing call from said mobile terminal thus preventing a mobile user from losing

desired broadcast content when interrupted by an incoming call. There are a finite number of predictable potential solutions to this above need: 1) automatic record of the broadcast when there is a call and 2) manual recording of the broadcast when there is a call. A person of ordinary skill in the art, upon reading the Engstrom reference, would have also recognized and have good reason to pursue the above known options of manual and automatic recording of the broadcast, which would lead to a reasonable expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 2, Engstrom teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Engstrom further teaches detecting termination of an incoming or outgoing call (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3) and stopping recording of the broadcast signal when the termination of an incoming or outgoing call is detected (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3).

Regarding Claim 3, Engstrom teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Engstrom further detecting termination of an incoming or outgoing call; and playing back recorded broadcast signal information, when the termination of an incoming or outgoing call is detected (Col. 10 lines 36 – 39, lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3).

Regarding Claims 4, Engstrom teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claims 1. Engstrom further teaches wherein the broadcast signal is recorded in a recording device installed in the terminal device (Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3).

Regarding Claim 10, Engstrom teaches a mobile terminal device comprising a broadcast signal receiving function and a communication function, wherein a currently

received broadcast signal is recorded when an outgoing or incoming call is detected during receiving of a broadcast signal (Figure 8, Cols. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3).

Engstrom does not teach wherein the mobile terminal device comprises an interface configured to inquire whether the currently received broadcast signal should be recorded or not. However, there had been a need in the art, at the time of the invention, to integrate recording broadcast features into a mobile phone or mobile terminal. Additionally, there also had been a need to record broadcasts when there is an incoming call to the mobile terminal or an outgoing call from said mobile terminal thus preventing a mobile user from losing desired broadcast content when interrupted by an incoming call. There are a finite number of predictable potential solutions to this above need: 1) automatic record of the broadcast when there is a call and 2) manual recording of the broadcast when there is a call. A person of ordinary skill in the art, upon reading the Engstrom reference, would have also recognized and have good reason to pursue the above known options of manual and automatic recording of the broadcast, which would lead to a reasonable expectation of success.

Regarding Claim 22, Engstrom teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 1. Engstrom further teaches a program stored on a computer readable medium for implementing broadcast recording (Col. 8 lines 46 – 50, mobile phones and PDAs comprise processors, which execute program instructions, that enable said PDAs and phones to conduct various functions, said programs are stored in memory).

Regarding Claim 23, Engstrom teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 22. Engstrom further teaches a recording medium holding a program for

implementing the broadcast recording method (Col. 8 lines 46 – 50, mobile phones and PDAs comprise processors, which execute program instructions, that enable said PDAs and phones to conduct various functions, said instructions are stored in memory).

10. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engstrom (US 7,065,333) in view of Cahill (5,150,384) and in further view of Lee et al. (US 2002/0013143)

Regarding Claim 6, Engstrom teaches a broadcast recording method utilizing a terminal device having a broadcast signal receiving function and a communication function (Figure 5, Cols. 8 lines 46 – 50, lines 51 – 55), comprising: detecting an incoming or outgoing call during receiving of a broadcast signal (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3).

Engstrom does not teach detecting a failure to receive the broadcast signal during the receiving of a broadcast and selectively recording the broadcast signal in the mobile terminal device or in a recording device installed in an external recording server when an incoming or outgoing call is detected or recording the broadcast signal in a recording device installed in an external recording server when a failure to receive the broadcast signal is detected

Cahill teaches detecting a failure to receive the broadcast signal during the receiving of a broadcast (Col. 7 lines 17 – 35, the loop will speed up during signal recovery, the signal will be recovered when there is exiting of a fade).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Engstrom with the failure detection method of Cahill for the purpose of providing optimal receiver performance during fading conditions as taught by Cahill.

Lee teaches recording the broadcast signal in a recording device installed in an external recording server when a failure to receive the broadcast signal is detected (Sections 0035 lines 1 – 4, 0038, not connecting within a certain period of time prevents the broadcast signal from being received, which is a failure to receive the broadcast signal).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Engstrom in view of Cahill with the above capability of Lee for the purpose of providing backup storage for broadcast information when the mobile cannot record said information as taught by Lee.

11. Claims 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engstrom (US 7,065,333) in view of Lee et al. (US 2002/0013143)

Regarding Claim 12, Engstrom teaches a communication device comprising: a broadcast signal receiver for receiving the broadcast signal (Col. 8 lines 53 – 55); a receiving signal recorder for recording the broadcast information acquired from the received broadcast signal (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3), a call detector for detecting an incoming or outgoing call, or termination of an incoming or outgoing call (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3); and a recording-

start/playback command information generating circuit for generating recording-start and playback-command information (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 36 – 39, lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3), notifying the receiving signal recording portion about the broadcast signal recording command information (Figure 8, Col. 10 lines 52 – 67, 11 lines 1 – 3, in order to start recording or start playback there will need to be a notification to start recording or playback).

Engstrom does not teach a receiving-status detector for detecting a status of the broadcast signal receiving.

Lee teaches a receiving-status detector for detecting a status of the broadcast signal receiving (Sections 0035 lines 1 – 4, 0038, not connecting within a certain period of time prevents the broadcast signal from being received).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Engstrom with the above capability of Lee for the purpose of providing backup storage for broadcast information when the mobile cannot record said information as taught by Lee.

12. Claims 57 – 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. (US 2002/0013143) in view of Cahill (5,150,384)

Regarding Claim 57, Lee teaches a broadcast recording method utilizing a mobile terminal device having broadcast signal receiving function and a mobile communication function comprising: recording the broadcast signal when a failure of receiving broadcast signal is detected (Sections 0035 lines 1 – 4, 0038, not connecting

within a certain period of time prevents the broadcast signal from being received and thus there is a failure to receive the broadcast signal).

Lee does not teach detecting a failure to receive a broadcast signal during receiving of a broadcast.

Cahill teaches detecting a failure to receive the broadcast signal during the receiving of a broadcast (Col. 7 lines 17 – 35, the loop will speed up during signal recovery, the signal will be recovered when there is exiting of a fade).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Lee with the failure detection method of Cahill for the purpose of providing optimal receiver performance during fading conditions as taught by Cahill.

Regarding Claim 58, Lee in view of Cahill teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in Claim 57. Lee further teaches wherein the broadcast signal is recorded in a recording device installed in an external recording server (Sections 0035 lines 1 – 4, 0038, not connecting within a certain period of time can be due the mobile phone being located in a region where the signal environment is not good).

***Allowable Subject Matter***

13. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding Claim 61, The prior art of record fails to teach or show the feature of **transmitting a command signal, to an external recording server, to record a**



**broadcast signal currently being recorded by a recording device installed in the mobile terminal device on the external recording server when the detector detects that the broadcast signal cannot be recorded in the recording device installed in the terminal device.** Claims 18 – 21 are allowable for the same reasons set forth above.

Claims 5, 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding Claim 5, The prior art of record fails to teach or show the feature of **recording the broadcast signal in a recording device installed in an external recording server in response to a request from the mobile device via a mobile communication network accessible to the mobile communication function.**

Regarding Claim 14, The prior art of record fails to teach or show the feature of the mobile terminal comprising **a playback information receiver for receiving playback information from the recording server via the communication network.**

### ***Conclusion***

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAYMOND S. DEAN whose telephone number is (571)272-7877. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 6:00-2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban can be reached on 571-272-7899. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Raymond S Dean/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2618

Raymond S. Dean  
September 16, 2008